

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, and 11, which are independent, have been amended. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed, specifically at pages 19 and 20. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

### **II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,175,772 to Kamiya, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,488 to Edatsune, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,144,938 to Surace, et al.

Claims 2 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,175,772 to Kamiya, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,488 to

Edatsune and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,144,938 to Surace, et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,260,016 to Holm, et al.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...substituting means, having a number of word substitute dictionaries, for substituting a word or words included in the text with a word or words from the number of word substitute dictionaries in accordance with pre-programmed personality information,

wherein said pre-programmed personality information includes a plurality of factors,

wherein a substitute dictionary is selected from a plurality of substitute dictionaries as a function of the plurality of factors; and...” (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Patent No. 6,175,772 to Kamiya, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Kamiya”) relates to user-adaptive control of an object having pseudo-emotions by learning adjustments of emotion generating and behavior generating algorithms.

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Patent No. 5,802,488 to Edatsune (hereinafter, merely “Edatsune”) relates to interactive speech recognition with improved recognition relates by providing an interactive speech recognition device that performs recognition by taking situational and environmental changes into consideration.

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Patent No. 6,144,938 to Surace, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Surace”) relates to a voice user interface with personality.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Kamiya, Edatsune, or Surace, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, Kamiya, Edatsune, and Surace fail to teach or suggest substituting means, having a number of word substitute dictionaries, for substituting a word or words included in the

text with a word or words from the number of word substitute dictionaries in accordance with pre-programmed personality information, wherein said pre-programmed personality information includes a plurality of factors, a combination of which determine which of a plurality of substitute dictionaries is used by substituting means, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Applicants submit that the cited portions of Edatsune, specifically Column 11, line 7 to Column 12, line 56, **disclose that a response is a function of time elapsed only.**

Applicants submit that such disclosure does not teach or suggest a substitute dictionary is selected from a plurality of substitute dictionaries as a function **of the plurality of factors.**

Therefore, the disclosure in Edatsune does not render claim 1 unpatentable.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, amended independent claims 10 and 11 are also believed to be patentable.

### III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the above-identified reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the

Examiner specifically indicate the portion, or portions, of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By   
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800